



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,745	11/30/2001	Jakob Lichtenberg	0993-0101P	4472

2292 7590 11/13/2008
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

GEBRESILASSIE, KIBROM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2128

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/13/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/996,745	Applicant(s) LICHTENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner KIBROM K. GEBRESILASSIE	Art Unit 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-34,36-39 and 44-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-34,36-39 and 44-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/06/2008 has been entered.
2. Claims 1, 3, 5-34, 36-39, and 44-46 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants are thanked for amendments/Remarks.
4. Applicant's argument relating to Drawing Objection is not persuasive. As applicants admitted, BDD graphical representation is well known in the art and therefore the graphical representation have not invented by applicants. For this reason, Fig. 4-10 Applicants have not invented the BDD graphical representation as seen in Fig. 5.
5. Applicant's amendment relating to Claim Objection is considered and therefore the objection is **withdrawn.**
6. Applicant's argument relating to 101 rejection is not persuasive and therefore the rejection is **maintained.** The claimed invention as a whole does not provide for practical application and there is no physical transformation or a useful, tangible, and concrete final result. For example, Claim 1 does not require any transformation and reduction of an article to a different state or thing. Claim 1 is not tied to a particular machine or apparatus that transforms data in such a way to produce a useful, concrete and tangible

Art Unit: 2128

result. Further, claim 1 does not recite any electrical, chemical, or mechanical acts or results, which typical in traditional process claims.

7. The art rejection of claim 35 is **withdrawn** in view of cancellation of claim 35.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

9. Figures 4-10 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicants specification recites as follows:

BDDs has a well known graphical representation. Figure 5 is an example of this representation. The figure is a BDD over two variables X_0 and X_1 . The chosen ordering \prec of the variables is $X_0 \prec X_1$ and the BDD represents the formula:

$$X_0 \rightarrow ((X_1 \rightarrow 0, 1), 1) = (\neg X_0) \vee (\neg X_1).$$

The BDD graphic representations are well known and are **PRIOR ART**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2128

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1, 3, 5-34, 36-39, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter since the claims as a whole do not provide for practical application and there is no physical transformation or a useful, tangible, and concrete final result (MPEP 2106: State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F.3d 1368, 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601-02 (Fed. Cir. 1998)). (the "**transformation data**" "**by a machine**" "into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation" because "**a final share price (i.e. real world value)** is momentarily fixed for recording and reporting purposes and even accepted and relied upon by regulatory authorities and in subsequent trades").

Claim 1 does not require any transformation and reduction of an article to a different state or thing. Nor is the "process" tied to a particular machine or apparatus that transforms data in such a way to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Claim 1 represents mere abstraction; i.e. a disembodied mathematical concept representing nothing more than an "abstract idea" which has not been reduced to some practical application that renders it "useful". As the Supreme Court has made it clear, "an idea of itself is not patentable" (See, e.g., Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard, 87 U.S. (20 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874)).

Further, claim 1 does not recite any electrical, chemical, or mechanical acts or results, which typical in traditional process claims.

The dependent claims inherit the deficiency.

Applicants Own Admission

12. The following is noted from the specification:

Page 7, lines 30-33:

30 This method is rather simple in that the constructing of a partial DAG from a rule is normally a simple task -
and the combination of DAGs is a well-known technique, which is, actually, facilitated if the above ordering
of the expressions is used.

Page 17, lines 30-34:

- The product model is encoded as a virtual table. The virtual table is a directed acyclic graph that represents all consistent configurations. This concrete directed acyclic graph is a Boolean Decision Diagram (BDD) (known to the man skilled in the field of *symbolic model checking*) with two variables external (representing that the selected gear is external) and carbon (representing that the carbon

Page 25, lines 3-5:

A Boolean Decision Diagram (BDD) is a DAG comprising nodes each containing a single Boolean variable. It is well known from the area of formal verification of hardware circuits that BDDs can be used to encode arbitrary Boolean functions of type (where n is the number of Boolean variables):

Page 25, lines 16-19:

For example, Difference Decision Diagrams (See Möller et al: *Difference Decision Diagrams*. In proceedings Annual Conference of the European Association for Computer Science Logic (CSL), September 20-25 1999, Madrid, Spain.) can be used to express (a sub-set of) functions of type $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, and at the same time provides the needed algorithms. The immediate advantage is that we thereby have a method of encoding product models where the rules comprise (a restricted subset) of quantified expression over variables with

Page 25, lines 23-29 and page 26 lines 1-4:

Art Unit: 2128

Another approach, relevant when the rules of the product model comprises more general arithmetic operations is the use of BDDs over *interpreted Boolean variables* (see W. Chan, R. J. Anderson, P. Beame, and D. Notkin: *Combining constraint solving and symbolic model checking for a class of systems with non-linear constraints*. In O. Grumberg, editor, Computer Aided Verification, 9th International Conference, CAV'97 Proceedings, volume 1254 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 316-327, Haifa, Israel, June 1997. Springer-Verlag.). Each Boolean variable represents a formula, a path in the DAG represents a conjunction of such formulas and satisfiability of such path can be determined using for example linear programming.

The encoding the product model as a virtual table will in the following be described in its preferred embodiment (using BDDs). However, the person skilled in the art can tweak the algorithms to use a different underlying data structured, for example one of the two data structures mentioned above.

Page 30, lines 1-15:

The use of Boolean Decision Diagrams for the representation of Boolean formulas is well known. For an introduction to Boolean Decision Diagrams see [Cristoph Meinel & Thorsten Theobald: *Algorithms and Data Structures in VLSI Design*, Springer 1998]. We will use the following (well known) textual representation of BDDs:

- 0 represents the terminal BDD 0 (true),
- 1 represents the terminal BDD 1 (false),
- $(a \otimes b)$ represents the BDD obtained by applying a and b with the any binary Boolean operator denoted by \otimes operator.
- $\exists x. a$ represents the BDD obtained by existentially quantifying out the variable x from the BDD a .
- $\{x \rightarrow a, b\}$ is the BDD representing the formula if x then a else b , which can be expressed in terms of simpler operators as $(x \wedge a) \vee (\neg x \wedge b)$.

BDDs has a well known graphical representation. Figure 5 is an example of this representation. The figure is a BDD over two variables X_0 and X_1 . The chosen ordering \preceq of the variables is $X_0 \preceq X_1$ and the BDD represents the formula:

$$X_0 \rightarrow (\{X_1 \rightarrow 0, 1\}, 1) = (\neg X_0) \vee \{X_1\}.$$

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2128

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. Claims 1, 3, 5-34, 36-38, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5, 515, 524 issued to Lynch et al. in view of H.

Peltonen, T. Mannisto, R. Sulonen, and K. Alho, "An Object for Evolutionary Configuration Management", 1993, and further in view of Applicants Own Admission (herein referred as AOA).

15. As per claim 1, Lynch discloses a method of configuring a apparatus comprising a number of components (such as...*method and apparatus for configuring systems...*; See: Title), the method comprising:

providing, for each component, information relating to a group of alternatives for the component (such as...See: Abstract lines 1-6; Fig. 2),,

iteratively configuring the apparatus by repeatedly: choosing a current component, when at least one of alternative for the current component is selectable by a user, selecting selectable one of alternatives for the current component (such as...*the system configuration can be based on specific component requests...once the system is*

Art Unit: 2128

configured, the configured system can be bundled into product... See: Col. 5 lines 53-62),

wherein the iterative configuring is ended when an alternative is chosen for each component and when the chosen alternative of the components are compatible (such as...*after a system is configured, the elements of the configuration can be bundled...*; See: Col. 9 lines 37-40).

Lynch discloses a constraint based configuration system using a structural model hierarchy. However, Lynch fails to disclose defining rules relating to compatibilities between alternatives from different components, representing the rules in a Direct Acyclic Graph (DAG), the DAG including at least one node having at least two pointers to the node, checking the DAG whether the selected alternative is compatible with other selected alternative of other chosen components, thereby the apparatus being configured using all of the selected alternative for all of the component.

Peltonen et al discloses defining rules relating to compatibilities between alternatives from different components, representing the rules in a Direct Acyclic Graph (DAG) (such as... *a constraint in an object can refer to other objects by means of reference and component attributes...* (See: pg. 14 section "4.1 Reference to Other objects)...*a constraint in an object can refer to components of the object by role names using function comp(role path pattern)...**the elevator must have exactly one component in the role of a car and exactly one component in the role of a motor and attribute weight of the car must not exceed attribute max_load of the motor (i.e. defining rules relating to compatibilities between different components...)...**this can be expressed by adding the*

Art Unit: 2128

following constraint to some ancestor of e1....; See: pg. 14-15, section "4.2. Component DAGs and Roles"), the DAG including at least one node having at least two pointers to the node (See: Fig. 9), checking the DAG whether the selected alternative is compatible with other selected alternative of other chosen components, thereby the apparatus being configured using all of the selected alternative for all of the component (such as...check the validity of a configuration since configuration will be represented as composite objects...; See: pg. 5 section "2.4 Constraints" lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Peltonen et al with the teaching of Lynch et al because both the reference concern with configuring a product. The motivation to do so would be to select and check the validity of a design in terms of a design component request.

16. As per claim 2, Canceled.

17. As per claim 3, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the step of selecting the alternative, and before the selection of the alternative, comprises: using the DAG to determine, for at least one of the components, a subset of alternatives for the component, so that each of the alternatives in the subset is compatible with the chosen alternatives from the other components (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27), and providing this information to the user (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46).

18. As per claim 4, Cancelled.

19. As per claim 5, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the steps of choosing a component and the alternative further comprise, for each of the

Art Unit: 2128

components: using the DAG to check which of the alternatives of the component that are compatible with at least one of the chosen alternatives of each of the other components (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27), providing the user with this information (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46), allowing the user to select one of the alternatives that were compatible with at least one of each of the other' component's chosen alternatives (See: Col. 13 lines 11-14).

20. As per claim 6, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the steps of selecting the alternative and checking the DAG further comprise the steps of: selecting or defining a subgroup of alternatives to the chosen component, checking the DAG for which of the alternatives in the subgroup that are compatible with chosen alternatives from other components, and providing information relating to which of the alternatives in the subgroup are compatible with chosen alternatives of other components (See: col. 5 lines 49-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27).

21. As per claim 7, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the iterative configuration further comprises: at least once, defining information relating to limiting the alternatives of at least one of the components, and checking the DAG for which of the alternatives of the components is compatible with the limiting information (See: Col. 29 lines 42-61).

22. As per claim 8, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1 in which the iterative configuring is ended upon request from a user, and information is provided relating to all possible compatible apparatuses comprising at least one chosen

Art Unit: 2128

alternative for each of the apparatuses for which an alternative is chosen (See: Col. 5 lines 59-62), and this information is provided to the user (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46).

23. As per claim 9, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1 in which the iterative configuring comprises the steps of obtaining a number of all possible compatible apparatuses comprising at least one chosen alternative for each of the apparatuses for which an alternative is chosen (See: Col. 5 lines 59-62), and providing this information to the user (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46).

24. As per claims 10-31, Claims 10-31 recite the structure and feature of DAG, which is merely using the existing features of the prior art (See: Applicants Admission).

Applicants do not disclose inventing a DAG system. Therefore, any claims directed to the structure and feature of DAG method must be regarded as being a prior art. All the features and limitation recited in claim 10-30 are prior art and disclosed in Applicants Admission shown above.

25. As per claim 32, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, the method further comprising: identifying a user, performing the step of selecting an alternative of a component by the user through communication between a device controlled by the user and another device where the iterative configuration is performed, transmitting information relating to the checking of the DAG to the user (See: col. 30 lines 40-45).

26. As per claim 33, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: identifying a user, prior to the iterative configuring: transmitting the DAG to a device controlled by the user (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46), performing the iterative configuring on the user's device (See: Col. 30 lines 46-52).

Art Unit: 2128

27. As per claim 34, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of, during the iterative configuration: obtaining information relating to one or more alternatives for components for which no alternatives have been chosen, each of the one or more alternatives being compatible with the chosen alternatives (See: Col. 30 lines 35-39), and providing the user' with this information (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46).

28. As per Claim 35, Canceled.

29. As per claim 36, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the method further comprises identifying a configurable device and an interface device, and storing the DAG representing the rules on the configurable device, uploading the DAG from the configurable device to the interface device, and in the step of iteratively configuring the apparatuses, performing the checking of the DAG whether the alternative selected is compatible with other chosen alternatives from other components on the interface device (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27).

30. As per claim 37, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 36 wherein the method further' comprises identifying a list of predetermined components in the configurable device and identifying a list of predetermined alternatives for these components in the configurable device, and wherein the step of iteratively configuring the apparatuses further comprises performing the checking of the DAG whether the alternative selected is compatible with other chosen alternatives from other components and compatible with the predetermined alternatives on the interface device (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27).

Art Unit: 2128

31. As per claim 38, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the method further comprises identifying a list of observer components and a list of non-observer components, and

representing the rules for the non-observer components in a DAG, determining, for each observer component, a subset of the rules, such that from these rules it is possible to determine the alternatives for the observer component that are compatible with alternatives for the non-observer components (See: Abstract),

representing for each observer component the subset of rules as an observer DAG, and in the step of iteratively configuring the apparatuses (See: Abstract),

checking the DAG whether the alternative selected is compatible with other chosen alternatives from other components (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27),

determining a set of system determined alternatives by determining for each component whether there is only a single alternative compatible with all the chosen alternatives (See: Col. 5 lines 59-62),

for at least one of the observer components, checking the observer DAG for the observer component to determine whether there is only a single alternative compatible with other chosen alternatives and the set of system determined alternatives (See: col. 5 lines 64-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-27), and

providing this information to a user (See: Col. 30 lines 33-46).

32. As per claim 40-43, canceled.

33. As per claim 44, Peltonen et al discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the DAG has at least one path from a topmost node to a bottom most node satisfying all of the rules in the DAG, each of the components having one alternative in the at least one path such that the alternative of each of the components in the at least one path is compatible with each other (See: Fig. 9).

34. As per claim 45, Lynch discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the alternatives of the current component is compatible with the other selected alternatives respectively for the other chosen components and is compatible with at least one of the alternatives in each of yet-to-be-chosen components (See: Abstract).

35. As per Claim 46, Peltonen et al discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the rules represented in the DAG is defined to guarantee that when one of the alternatives is selected for a first one of the components, at least one apparatus configuration exists by using the selected one of the alternatives for the first one of the components and using one of the alternatives for each of the other components (such as...*the elevator must have exactly one component in the role of a car and exactly one component in the role of a motor and attribute weight of the car must not exceed attribute max_load of the motor ...this can be expressed by adding the following constraint to some ancestor of e1....*; See: pg. 14-15, section “4.2. Component DAGs and Roles”).

Allowable Subject Matter

36. Claim 39 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

37. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 9 is considered allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims since when reading the claim in light of the specification, none of the reference record alone or in combination disclose or suggest the combination of limitation specified, specifically, *adopting the classification to one of a list of outcomes comprising blocked, selectable, user selected, system selected, or forceable, providing a classification of blocked when the alternative cannot be chosen for the component even without considering choices of alternatives for other components, providing a classification of selectable when the alternative for the component is compatible with the chosen alternatives from the other components, providing a classification of user selected when the alternative has already been chosen for the component, providing a classification of system selected when the alternative is the only choice for the component that is*

Art Unit: 2128

compatible with the chosen alternatives from the other components and the alternative has not been chosen by the user, providing a classification of forceable when the alternative can be chosen for the component but is incompatible with some of the other choices of alternatives of the other components (as specified in specification pg. 14 lines 21 through pg. 15 line 9, pg. 38 lines 5-19, pg. 41 line 23 through pg. 44 lines 11).

Conclusion

38. All claims are rejected.

39. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

40. **Examiner Remarks:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

41. **Examiner Request:** In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification

which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

MPEP states:

"...with respect to newly added or amended claims, applicant should show support in the original disclosure for the new or amended claims. See MPEP § 714.02 and § 2163.06."

42. **Requests for Interview:** In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(a)(3), requests for interview must be made in advance. Interview requests are to be made by telephone (571-272-8571) or FAX (571-273-8571). Applicants must provide a detailed agenda as to what will be discussed (generic statement such as "discuss §102 rejection" or "discuss rejections of claims 1-3" may be denied interview). The detail agenda along with any proposed amendments is to be written on a PTOL-413A or a custom form and should be faxed (or emailed, subject to MPEP 713.01.I / MPEP 502.03) to the Examiner at least 3 days prior to the scheduled interview. Interview requests submitted within amendments may be denied because the Examiner was not notified, in advance, of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request and due to time constraints may not be able to review the interview request to prior to the mailing of the next Office Action.

Communications

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kibrom K. Gebresilassie whose telephone number is 571-272-8571. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.

Art Unit: 2128

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini S. Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kibrom K Gebresilassie/
Examiner, Art Unit 2128

/Hugh Jones/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128